

-2-

throughout the Specification, for example at page 2, line 25 through page 3, line 15. Claims 2, 5 and 16 depend from Claim 1 and thus carry the same limitation.

Applicant's attorney has revised the arguments presented in the originally filed Amendment C to address the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, and 16, as well as the rejection of Claims 57-59. The revised arguments are presented below.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 16 and 57-59 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 16 and 57-59 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Goulin *et al.* (J. Neurosci. Res. February 15, 1996).

In light of Applicants' cancellation of Claim 59, the rejection of this claim is moot. With respect to Claims 1, 2, 5, 16, 57 and 58, Applicants respectfully disagree. Goulin *et al.* discloses the following compositions:

- (i) NGF + FGF-2 (for example, at p. 459)
- (ii) CNTF + FGF-2 (for example, at p. 459)
- (iii) TGF $\beta$ 3 + FGF-2 (for example, at p. 459, 460)
- (iv) GDNF + FGF-2 (for example, at p. 460)
- (v) TGF $\beta$ 3 + GDNF + FGF-2 (for example, at p. 461)

Applicants' have amended Claim 1 to add the limitation: "and wherein if a first cytokine is GDNF, then a second cytokine is not FGF". Goulin *et al.* teach five compositions, namely (i) NGF + FGF-2; (ii) CNTF + FGF-2; (iii) TGF $\beta$ 3 + FGF-2; (iv) GDNF + FGF-2; and (v) TGF  $\beta$ 3 + GDNF + FGF-2. The first two compositions of Goulin *et al.* clearly do not anticipate Claim 1 because at least one cytokine of the composition is not BMP, GDF, TGF- $\beta$  or GDNF. Composition (iii) does not anticipate Claim 1 because of the proviso language of Claim 1 ("wherein if a first cytokine is TGF- $\beta$ , then a second cytokine is not NT-3, NT-4 or FGF"). The proposed amendment to Claim 1 should overcome the 35 U.S.C § 102(b) rejection as being anticipated by the Goulin *et al.* disclosure of composition (iv). Lastly, composition (v) does not anticipate Claim 1 because of the proviso language, as noted above. Claims 2, 5 and 16 depend from Claim 1 and thus carry the same limitations.

Claims 57 and 58, as amended, recite a "composition having synergistic neurotrophic activity consisting of two cytokines, wherein the two cytokines are GDNF and TGF- $\beta$ ...." Applicants amendment to recite "two cytokines" is to further make clear that GDNF and TGF- $\beta$

-3-

are cytokines, although this was already well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of filing of the application. Goulin *et al.* do not disclose a composition consisting of GDNF and TGF- $\beta$ , thus Goulin *et al.* does not anticipate Claims 57 and 58, as amended.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (978) 341-0036.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Doreen M. Hogle

Doreen M. Hogle

Registration No. 36,361

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: June 25, 2003